

RXL

Bazow

4-5-62

April 5, 1962

Dear Lou -

I am sorry to take so long to send this back to you, but there were a half-dozen other mes. of a longer backlog that had accumulated and needed very detailed review. And I'm afraid I can't put more than an hour or two a day in this kind of work without tiring. But I'm glad to at least have gotten to see it before we take off for Japan tomorrow.

This is certainly a worthwhile contribution, and there could be no doubt about its value for publication in Genetics or J. Bact. But PNAS has been growing so large that we have been asked to be very careful in communicating papers by other authors, and it does seem to me that the interest in this report would be more specialized than, e.g., your initial report on Salmonella crossing or the paper with Harmer et al. on the pycnography of the hybrid DNA. In any case, there is now an 8 page limit for PNAS. So on several counts I think this might better go to Genetics or J Bact. And what's against that?

I'm a little puzzled about calling the fragment  $F^0 \cdot lac^+$ , which might imply that it confers the  $F^0$  quality. It seems to behave rather like  $F_{13}$  except for its stability (not reverting to  $F^+$ ) and restricted extent. But the particle must confer conjugability and some of the  $f^+$  antigen. If there is any argument for the  $F^0$  notation for incompatible  $F^-$ , there is no point conferring that assue with a similar designation for an  $F$ -related particle. Re Hirota, see Sneth's review in Br. med. Bull. 18(1): 41 (Jan. '62).

Our best to Rhoda and yourself,

J. D. Murray.